JPRS 77814

13 April 1981

Worldwide Report

LAW OF THE SEA

No. 149

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available from Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS 77814

13 April 1981

WORLDWIDE REPORT

LAW OF THE SEA

No. 149

CONTENTS

WORLDWIDE AFFAIRS

Oslo Paper on Coming Decisions on Sea Boundary Questions
(Morten Fyhn; AFTENPOSTEN, 27 Mar 81) 1

Oslo Paper on Latest Round of Fishing Talks With Soviets
(Morten Fyhn; AFTENPOSTEN, 31 Mar 81) 3

ASIA

INDIA

'STATESMAN' Claims 'Dice Loaded Against Developing Nations'
(S. Sahay; THE STATESMAN, 19 Feb 81) 5

PAKISTAN

U.S. Position on Law of Sea Criticized
(Editorial; THE MUSLIM, 15 Mar 81) 9

Multipurpose Fishery Project Next Month
(THE MUSLIM, 14 Mar 81) 11

THAILAND

Government Proclaims 200-Mile Zone
(THE WORKING PEOPLE'S DAILY, 11 Mar 81) 12

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

NIGERIA

Fishing Methods Said Dangerous to Marine Life
(Segun Adebayo; DAILY STAR, 27 Feb 81) 13

Tidal Wave Floods Victoria Island, Maroko
(DAILY TIMES, 9 Mar 81) 14

WEST EUROPE

NETHERLANDS

Paper Views U.S. Stance on Law of the Sea
(Editorial; NRC HANDELSBLAD, 24 Mar 81) 15

OSLO PAPER ON COMING DECISIONS ON SEA BOUNDARY QUESTIONS

LD021127 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 27 Mar 81 p 8

["Commentary" by Morten Fyhn: "Northern Continental Shelf Problems"]

[Text] For a considerable time now there has been little attention paid to Norway's many as yet unsolved problems in the northern areas, but now something deserving of interest is once again beginning to happen. This is the question of the division of the Jan Mayen continental shelf with Iceland and the problem of the demarcation line in the Barents Sea between the Norwegian and Soviet economic zones and on the continental shelf. A commission of arbitration is in the process of completing its work on the Jan Mayen shelf, and there will probably be negotiations with the Russians in Oslo in May on the Barents Sea.

Despite the fact that the official Norwegian view is that relations with Iceland are in a special class and that demarcation line solutions and other agreements will have no effect on negotiations with the Russians, there can hardly be any doubt that the Russians will try as much as possible to exploit the commission of arbitration's work on Jan Mayen and the final outcome of this conflict. The problems in the Barents Sea and those off Jan Mayen are fairly similar in principle, at least as far as the continental shelf is concerned.

Last year Norway set up a 200-mile fishing zone around Jan Mayen after tough negotiations with Iceland, in which Norway drew the shortest straw and made concessions in the conflict over the overlapping area between the two adjoining zones. There were to be no infringements of the 200-mile Icelandic zone by the Jan Mayen zone. This was a solution for fisheries, while the problem of the Continental Shelf was left to a commission of arbitration consisting of three members--Icelandic law of the sea Ambassador Hans Andersen, Ambassador Jens Evensen and then leader of the U.S. law of the sea delegation Ambassador Elliot Richardson.

Today this commission has more or less finished its work, but there are reasons to think that its interim proposal for a demarcation line is so little attractive to the Norwegian government that a final solution is not just around the corner.

The problem of the Jan Mayen continental shelf is basically simple: There is a distance of 290 nautical miles between Iceland and Jan Mayen. The fact that Norway accepted last year the Iceland's economic zone should remain in force right up to

200 miles means that in the arbitration commission at least Iceland has demanded that it should have the same rights over the continental shelf. It is a political impossibility for any Icelandic government to accept anything less than 200 miles of continental shelf. This would leave 90 nautical miles, and the question with which the arbitration commission has had to deal is what is to be done with this area of seabed.

For practical and political reasons Norway would find it most suitable if the zone boundary and the continental shelf boundary coincided, that is, if Jan Mayen had a shelf boundary of 90 miles around it. But last year the Icelanders demanded the right of disposal over the shelf up to 12 nautical miles off Jan Mayen, while claiming that Jan Mayen has no claim to a continental shelf of any description.

There is reason to believe that the Icelanders, after receiving a clear Norwegian refusal of anything approaching full rights of disposal over the Jan Mayen shelf, have tried to push through a proposal for some sort of joint control over the part of the shelf more than 200 miles from Iceland, or alternatively a 50-50 division between Jan Mayen and Iceland. Both of these solutions have little attraction for Norway, both because Norway thinks that it made great concessions last year and because every solution which bears the stamp of joint jurisdiction with joint control could have an disadvantageous effect on the coming negotiations on a demarcation line in the Barents Sea.

The question of the continental shelf off Jan Mayen is not an urgent matter, now that a solution to the fishing question has been found. If the arbitration commission's proposals cannot be accepted by Norway, it could be better for Norway either to postpone negotiations or to take the matter before an international court.

The foreign ministry is now chewing over this problem at the same time as preparations are being made to meet the Russians in negotiations on the demarcation line in the Barents Sea. It is a long time since Norway signaled its willingness to compromise here by no longer insisting on the mid-line principle. The Soviet Union has so far given no indication of being prepared to abandon its sector-line principle.

The foreign ministry has adopted a wait-and-see attitude on the matter; it is now waiting for the Russians to make some sort of move. Bearing in mind the Jan Mayen continental shelf, Norway is most unwilling to agree to two different boundaries in the Barents Sea, one for the economic zone and one for the continental shelf. Agreeing to two different boundaries with Iceland could further complicate the negotiations on the Barents Sea.

CSO: 5200

OSLO PAPER ON LATEST ROUND OF FISHING TALKS WITH SOVIETS

LD021409 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 31 Mar 81 p 44

[Report by Morten Fyhn: "Soviet Union Allowed to Fish in Return for Recognition"]

[Text] Norway has given the Soviet Union a written promise that Russian fishing interests in the Norwegian fishing zone around Jan Mayen will be taken into consideration when fixing catch quotas. In return the Russians will drop their reservations with regard to the zone and will completely accept its establishment. According to AFTENPOSTEN's information this compromise was the result of 4 days of Norwegian-Soviet talks which ended in Oslo yesterday.

The first Norwegian-Soviet round of talks on the Jan Mayen zone--Norway makes it clear that there have never been any negotiations--took place in November last year at the request of the Russians. The point of departure then was Russian skepticism regarding Norway's right to establish a zone and Russian fears that it could have a damaging effect on their fishing in the area. This meeting did not lead to any clarification, and this was particularly due to the fact that Norway made it clear that it believed the question of Soviet fishing in the Jan Mayen zone came under the Norwegian-Soviet fisheries commission's ordinary quota negotiations.

After this second round of talks, which have been going on since last Wednesday [25 March], the Russians have now agreed that the question of quotas should be dealt with by the commission. This means that it is unlikely that there will be any further "special meetings" about Jan Mayen between Norway and the Soviet Union. But in return for this agreement and for the dropping of Soviet reservations to the zone, Norway has said that it is ready to give a promise, in reality a guarantee, that the Russians do not run the risk of being thrown out of the zone.

It has been stressed to AFTENPOSTEN that it has never been the intention for Norway to throw Soviet fishing vessels out of the zone. The promise made to the Russians states that Norway is aware of their traditional rights and will take them into consideration when administering the zone. This would make it possible for Norway to limit Russian fishing in the zone, either out of concern for the size of fish stocks or because Norwegian fishermen might be more interested than they are today in fishing for blue whiting [kolmule], which has been the Russians' main catch in the Jan Mayen area for several years. Last year the Russians caught a total of 761,000 tons of blue whiting in the Jan Mayen zone and in international waters.

But the Norwegian promise could mean that in future quota negotiations the Russians will claim that they have been given a Norwegian guarantee to maintain their position as the chief fishers of blue whiting in the area. During last year's round of talks with the Russians the fisheries ministry wanted Soviet blue whiting fishing in the Jan Mayen zone to form part of total Norwegian-Soviet quota negotiations, which would have given Norway a good negotiating card with which to achieve Russian counter-concessions. Yesterday's Norwegian promise could, as far as AFTENPOSTEN understands, make such an approach difficult. There is good reason to believe that the fisheries ministry holds the same opinion today as it did last year.

The last few days' talks with the Russians were led on the Norwegian side by Ambassador Jens Evensen, who will also lead the planned negotiations in May on the demarcation line in the Barents Sea. Evensen left yesterday for New York to take part in the Law of the Sea Conference, and declined to comment on the talks with the Russians before he left. Foreign ministry press spokesman Geir Grung in his turn had only been authorized to confirm that the Jan Mayen talks with the Russians had taken place.

CSO: 5200

'STATESMAN' CLAIMS 'DICE LOADED AGAINST DEVELOPING NATIONS'

Calcutta THE STATESMAN in English 19 Feb 81 p 8

[Article by S. Sahay]

[Text] Close on the heels of the non-aligned Foreign Minister's Conference, the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee organized a conference to discuss its strategy for the Law of the Sea conference which begins on March 9 to take up the remaining (mercifully, few) unresolved problems and possibly finalize the draft convention pretty soon. Since the policy of the developed nations, in particular of the super Powers, on the high seas is mere extension of their policy on land, and the problems facing the developing nations the same everywhere, it was only appropriate that the two conferences should have been held in New Delhi. Both have highlighted the sheer inability of the developing nations to check the onward march, at their cost, of the developed nations. While an assessment of the success or failure of the non-aligned Foreign Ministers' Conference would depend upon one's expectations from it, most people would agree that, whatever its other accomplishments, it did not emerge as a force which would begin to worry the super Powers.

Negotiations

However, to confine oneself to the Law of the Sea conference, it would be inappropriate to minimize its achievements after nearly a decade of protracted negotiations. The draft convention takes in its sweep territorial sea and contiguous zones, archipelagic States, exclusive economic zones, continental shelf, high seas, regime of islands enclosed or semi-enclosed areas, the rights of landlocked States, the international sea-bed area, protection of marine environment marine research and transfer of marine technology and the procedure for settling disputes. It is creditable indeed that consensus has been reached on most of these issues. However, anyone studying the draft Convention in the light of the protracted negotiations that have gone on so far cannot fail to notice that, where their economic and defence interests are concerned, the developed nations have manoeuvred to place the conference in a position where they want it to be. The developing nations have lost one battle after another.

To appreciate this a few facts need to be recapitulated. The Law of the Sea conference is founded on two U.N. resolutions, one declaring the resources of the sea-bed outside national jurisdiction to be the common heritage of mankind and the other convoking the U.N. conference on the Law of the Sea. Then there

is a third resolution which puts a moratorium or economic activities on the high seas until a convention is signed. The three resolutions would ordinarily give the impression that nothing be done to dilute the main principle that the high seas are the common heritage of mankind, but the USA and the other developed nations have argued that the resolutions do not create a legal order which prevents a country from mining or otherwise exploiting the high seas until a treaty has been signed.

To support word by deed, they have either already adopted pieces of national legislation or are about to do so. Thus the USA passed the Deep Seabed Hard Mineral Resources Act in June 1980. West Germany too has its own legislation. Britain has already introduced a Bill and France, Belgium and Japan too are about to do so. It is no coincidence that it is these nations, with perhaps the exception of Britain, which, in various combinations, have formed consortia to exploit deep sea-bed resources.

The provisions of the U.S. act are instructive. They assume that the Law of the Sea negotiations may not be completed in the near future; even if they are, much time would elapse before an international regime is established. But (and this is a point to note) potential investors cannot work in an atmosphere of uncertainty, especially when any development of technology required for the exploration and recovery of hard mineral resources will require substantial investment for many years before commercial production can occur. The U.S. Act, therefore, establishes an interim legal regime in order to allow its nationals to develop the right kind of technology and to go ahead with actual or potential exploitation until the Law of the Sea treaty comes into force with respect to the USA.

There is only one self-imposed limitation. No licence will be issued before June 1981 and there can be no actual exploitation of the sea-bed mineral before January 1, 1988. This, one may add, is basically related to the state of research in deep seabed mining, apart from being an incentive to the Law of the Sea conference successfully to conclude its deliberations. Having left others in no doubt about what it seeks to achieve, the Act permits an American national to work under a licence granted by a reciprocating State, which means a State which recognizes licences and permits issued by the USA. Shorn of legal verbiage, this means that the developed nations which have or come to acquire the know-how may easily farm out among themselves the high seas for exploitation.

Letting the developing nations know what the developed nations can do has been one part of the design. The other part consists in trimming the draft sea laws to suit the overall interests of the developed nations. Take for instance the original proposal that deep sea-bed mining should be done by the proposed International Sea-bed Authority or in association with it. The developed nations saw to it that it was replaced by the "parallel" system, which envisages that anybody seeking a licence will have to offer two mining sites to the Authority, one to be worked by the licensee and the other to be reserved for exploitation by the Authority, or its organs. It is not without interest that the "parallel" idea was first mooted by Dr Henry Kissinger, when he was U.S. Secretary of State, after a desperate effort to advance his own country's interests.

Viability

This background should enable us to comprehend better the issues that remain to be solved by the Law of the Sea conference. These relate to the organization and structure of the Preparatory Commission, the treatment to be accorded to preparatory investments compatible with the convention together with the question of viability of the Enterprise (an arm of the Authority), participation in Convention and delimitation of the maritime zones.

Why a Preparatory Commission? The reason is that, as stipulated now, the Convention will come into force 12 months after the date of the deposit of the 60th instrument of Ratification or Accession. How long this will take cannot be said with certainty, but the American legislation, which visualizes actual exploitation of the deep seabed not before January 1, 1988, is a pointer. However, it is only desirable that some of the provisions of the convention should be acted upon as customary international law. In any case, certain preparatory work will be necessary in connexion with the conduct of sea-bed activities by the International Sea-Bed Authority.

The USA has its own notions of what the Preparatory Commission should be doing. In a note submitted to the Law of the Sea conference it has argued that most of the companies engaged in sea-mining research have reached or are about to reach the point where further investments in very large sums would have to be related to specific mining sites. Even in areas where investments need not be site-oriented, as for instance in construction of mining vessels and pilot processing plants, investors will shy away unless they are guaranteed the exclusive right to a mining site. Therefore, if the investigating companies are not to abandon their sea-bed activities or alternatively to oppose the Law of the Sea Convention so that they may proceed according to their own national legislation, two things must be assured. First, a priority must be fixed for the pre-convention investor in regard to a specific mine site and secondly, transmutation of such priorities into legal rights must be secured by the Convention when it comes into force. Similar priorities should also be created for Enterprise.

Warning

While there is some substance in the argument that, after a point of time, investments have to be site-oriented, it cannot be forgotten that the Law of the Sea conference is being given a clear warning that it had better accede to the U.S. demand, even if this means usurpation of the powers and function of the international Sea-bed Authority and its organs. If it does not American nationals will not only oppose the law but go their own way, if necessary in collaboration with the nationals of Britain, Japan, Belgium, France and West Germany. How the New York conference will tackle this subject will be watched with interest.

The question whether international and liberation organizations can participate in the convention has been left open. Can, for example, the European Economic Community and the Palestinian Liberation Organization sign the Convention? The advanced nations' argument is that the EEC can but the PLO cannot. The reason given is that the EEC nations have surrendered some of the rights to the EEC and hence they cannot, in those fields, fulfill the obligations laid down by

the convention. What these obligations are the advanced countries would not define on the ground that this is a developing field. In the same breath it is argued that the PLO cannot take part in the Convention because it is not a legal entity. It is forgotten that liberation organizations represent a nation or people who are either in colonial domination, which is in derogation of the principles of the U.N. Charter, or have been evicted from their homeland through foreign intervention and their rights have been recognized in U.N. resolutions.

The question of delimitation of maritime zones includes the territorial sea, contiguous zone and the continental shelf. Various proposals have been made. But whether a rigid formulation is possible remains to be seen.

All in all the dice is loaded against the developing nations. An early finalization of the convention is in sight, especially because the advanced nations have changed their strategy. Having mainly achieved what they have wanted they now want real action, with the help of the Convention if possible, without it if necessary.

CSO: 5200

U.S. POSITION ON LAW OF SEA CRITICIZED

Islamabad THE MUSLIM in English 15 Mar 81 p 4

[Editorial: "Law of the Sea"]

[Text] U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim, while opening the tenth session of the United Nations Law of the Sea Conference on Tuesday night, expressed his deep regret over U.S. decision to delay the completion of a treaty governing the world's oceans. The U.S. attitude in this regard has all along been unhelpful. It is now almost eight years since the world body first began the exercise of formulating a comprehensive law to regularise the exploitation of sea wealth. The U.S along with its rich Western partners appears to have already decided to preempt the U.N. efforts to save the sea from colonial machinations of the developed world. Former U.S. President Jimmy Carter signed a bill on July 28 last year allowing Western mining companies to start deep-sea mining in 1988 even if the Law of the Sea Treaty was not ratified by that time by the 60 states required to make a law. The one thing which is certain to block ratification of the Treaty is the Western World's inflexible attitude on the question of transfer of sea mineral technology and the powers of The Enterprise--a body to be set up under the International Sea-bed Authority for the exploration and exploitation of sea minerals.

The sea, which covers almost three-fourths of the globe, possesses minerals worth billions of dollars. But the funds needed for the exploitation of this bounty and the required technology are beyond the means and skill of the developing world which has as much right over these riches as the developed nation. In fact the U.N. has declared these riches as the common heritage of mankind. And this premise has led the world body to assume the responsibility of formulating an international accord which would facilitate all mankind to equally share the sea wealth. The Caracas Conference held in 1974 agreed to establish an Inter[illegible]al Sea-bed Authority which would formulate rules [illegible]over rights of passage underseas mining, navigation rules, exclusive economic zones, fishing regulations, marine research, definition of ocean ridges, the outer limits of continental shelves and a number of other items. Many of these issues have already been decided by consensus but this has raised some new questions, like how should the line be drawn to define the outer limits of the Continental Shelf where it extends beyond 200 miles? What

criteria should be used in delimiting overlapping maritime boundaries? What rules should apply to the conduct of marine scientific research in waters under the jurisdiction of maritime states? What type of international disputes over the law of the sea matters will the states be obliged to submit to binding forms of settlement? The major questions which, however, have yet to resolved relate to the system of exploration and exploitation of the resources of the sea, and financial arrangements including taxes to be paid by the contractor to the projected international sea-bed authority.

The developing countries want that the private contractors mining the world ocean beds should turn their technologies over to the Enterprise. These countries argue that technology is their *quid pro quo* for contractors' guaranteed access to the sea. The developed countries have rejected the technology transfer proposal on the grounds that they could not tell their private mining companies to deliver the technology to the Enterprise. This clearly reflects the developed world's desire to monopolise the riches of the sea. The delaying tactics adopted by the U.S. confirms this belief. It is obvious that no country, not even one as powerful as the U.S. can hope to get everything it wants in a treaty which involves the entire world. The treaty has to be a web of compromises. But the Reagan Administration wants to eat the cake and have it too. This attitude would certainly block the formulation of an agreed treaty even if the discussions are to prolong for another couple of years, by which time Carter's bill would have become law and the sea would become a colony of multinationals. There is also the apprehension that the national and international conflicts which have so far circumvented the establishment of peace on the earth would spill over to the sea compounding the malaise. It is, therefore, in the national interest of the U.S. to resist the pressures of its commercial lobby and bow to the will of the entire mankind which only wants a judicious sharing of the bounties of the sea wealth.

CSO: 5200

MULTIPURPOSE FISHERY PROJECT NEXT MONTH

Islamabad THE MUSLIM in English 14 Mar 81 p 6

[Text]

KARACHI, March 13. A multi-purpose four-year project aimed at achieving full and rational utilisation of fishery resources within the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of 200 miles will be launched next month.

The project, for which UNDP is providing 2.3 million dollars and Pakistan government contributing over Rs. 11 million, will enable Pakistan to create employment, increase the supply of protein and earn foreign exchange.

The immediate objective of the project will be to assess the technical and economic feasibility of commercial exploitation of known but under-utilised resources and to formulate clear guidelines for marine fisheries policy, planning and legislation.

It also aims at establishing monitoring systems and management measures for the most economic and important resources, such as shrimps.

It is also proposed to assess potential yield, availability and main characteristics of major fish stocks within the EEZ and to provide related scientific, biological and oceanographic information. PPI

CSO: 5200

GOVERNMENT PROCLAIMS 200-MILE ZONE

Rangoon THE WORKING PEOPLE'S DAILY in English 11 Mar 81 p 6

[Text] BANGKOK, 9 March—Thailand today announced a 200-nautical-mile economic zone in what it said was a bid to protect natural resources and explore energy potentials.

A royal command announced over Radio Thailand tonight said the declaration would entitle Thailand to prospect for natural sources on land, in the sea and on the continental shelf. This would include exploration for energy sources from air and water, it added.

In addition, Thailand would be entitled to research into matters related to marine science and to all other rights according to international law governing such a zone.

Moreover, shipping and the laying of cables would be done according to international practice.

Meanwhile, Thailand, the last South-East Asian state to declare an economic zone, would be prepared to negotiate questions arising from adjacent zones of neighbouring countries.

The Thai fishing industry is likely to be adversely affected by this zone declaration as it means fishermen would have to respect economic zones of other countries in the area.—*NAB/AFP*

CSO: 5200

FISHING METHODS SAID DANGEROUS TO MARINE LIFE

Enugu DAILY STAR in English 27 Feb 81 p 2

[Article by Segun Adebayo]

[Text]

THE statement credited to the Rivers State Commissioner for Agriculture, Chief S. B. Nwikpe (Nigerian Tide 28/1/81) is a timely one. Inter alia, the commissioner warned that the Rivers State government "was no longer prepared to allow a situation that would eventually lead to the extermination of its marine reserves." In effect, the State Government has frowned against obnoxious fishing methods.

This situation whereby some fishermen go about fishing with poisonous chemicals like Gamaline 20 is not peculiar to Rivers State alone. Here in Anambra the situation is the same not to talk of some other riverine areas in Cross River, Bendel, Lagos and many other states of the federation. It is country-wide.

These fishermen should be bluntly told that their action is counter-productive and dangerous not only to the consuming public but also to the users of such chemicals who could be exposed to dangerous health problems.

Apart from the danger inherent in the consumption of such poisoned fish, villagers around the rivers are in a great danger. The polluted water might be their only source of potable water. Unknowingly, they may consume the water and in the process, fall victims of the obnoxious act of these money-monger fishermen.

Further, fishing with these chemicals may lead to the extermination of fishes in our waters as both old and young will be completely wiped out of existence at the same time. The nation then stands a risk of shortage of fish, a very good source of protein.

If the action is prompted by efforts to make money, such fishermen should cease to pollute water and killing of the creatures therein. If it is to their lack of fishing equipment, they could form themselves into co-operative bodies so as to attract government attention. Infact, they will have no reason in saying that their lack of fishing equipment has dragged them to such a criminal act.

The attention of our health officials and the ministers of agriculture is called to these fishermen. The health officials could raid the market from time to time to discourage the sale of these poisoned fishes. They could as well carry out surprise visits to fish ponds and rivers in the neighbourhood.

This equally reminds one that our departmental stores should as well deserve the attention of our health officials. Samples of fish sold in their storage could be taken to the laboratory from time to time and without prior notice to ensure they are safe for consumption.

CSO: 5200

TIDAL WAVE FLOODS VICTORIA ISLAND, MAROKO

Lagos DAILY TIMES in English 9 Mar 81 p 1

[Text]

THE Bar Beach is lashing at Lagos City again, flooding vast areas of the exclusive Victoria Island and nearby Maroko, a high-density, low-income surburb.

Three days ago, the beach overflowed the sandy barriers opposite the Federal Government Guest House. A tidal wave swept into Maroko areas of Olukotun and Apese, from the south-eastern point of the Atlantic.

Maroko residents panicked as thunderous sounds of the wave and swift tidal currents overran the sandy barriers to empty in the neighbourhood.

An entire street was covered by floods and the inhabitants are now struggling to rescue the vicinity.

This is the first time in six years that tidal waves have caused a major upset in the area.

Maroko and four-fifths of Victoria Island were reclaimed four years ago to provide grounds for development.

The battle against sea erosion in Maroko and Victoria Island was waged in August 1974.

Then, the Federal Government granted N3.9 million to the Lagos State Government for a short-term solution to the erosion problem at the Victoria beach.

About three million cubic meters of sand were deposited at the beach between 1974 and 1975.

The fight against erosion at the beach followed fears that there was a serious threat to Victoria Island.

This was owing to the removal of about 600,000 cubic meters of sand yearly from the beach by sea erosion.

CSO: 5200

PAPER VIEWS U.S. STANCE ON LAW OF THE SEA

LD310947 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 24 Mar 81 p 7

[Editorial: "The United States' Word"]

[Text] The Reagan administration has demonstrated, to the extent that this was still necessary, that one of the inalienable prerogatives of a new president is to overthrow existing policy. But the decision to postpone U.S. participation at the UN Law of the Sea Conference "pending a review of policy by the United States" is of a totally different order. And it raises the question: How good is the United States' word in the world?

In fact the Law of the Sea Conference negotiations were not begun by the previous Carter administration. They date from 1973 and have been conducted for the United States under the authority of three very different presidents--Nixon, Ford and Carter. This has given rise to expectations among the 149 other states which have taken part in extremely complicated and difficult talks, which President Reagan now threatens to jeopardize within sight of port.

The U.S. about-face is principally connected with deep sea mining, the exploitation of those well-known manganese nodules and other minerals on the ocean floor. This has always been a sensitive issue for the United States throughout the long negotiating process, for up to now the nation is the only one with the knowhow to tap what is called "our planet's last great treasure."

It was the U.S. mining consortia which first managed to get the R publican Party program during the elections to return to the results of the negotiations and it is these consortia which now have obviously forced the president to react too. This in itself amounts to a misjudgment of the carefully considered compromise that the U.S. delegation, most recently under the leadership of former republican secretary Elliot L. Richardson, had reached.

It is true that the compromise provides for the establishment of a supreme authority for deep sea mining, together with a new international body, but it also contains an explicit admission of the rights of private enterprise--and in fact provides a Western veto in important questions. It is true that limitations have been fixed on production, but there is a "floor"--a minimum quantity which must be exploited in every case--which at least gives some control over decisions on the not inconsiderable investments associated with deep sea mining.

The paragraphs negotiated are definitely not uniformly favorable for the United States; but the same is true of its neighbour Canada, which as a mineral producer on land has compensatory interests.

The principal objection to the Reagan administration's threatened about-face is not really that it is once again tampering with the rather troublesome principle that the ocean floor should be seen as humanity's "common inheritance." What is worrying above all is that the U.S. Government is now isolating a subsidiary element from a network of compromises.

The new Law of the Sea treaty is a package deal that not only deals with deep sea mining, but also pollution, fisheries, the limits of economic zones at sea, and the orderly conduct of oil transports throughout the world. The game of give and take has been so far-reaching and so mutually binding that picking at one threat threatens to unravel the whole pattern.

Reagan's political associates try to give the impression that there is no great hurry with the Law of the Sea treaty. Apart from a fishing war off Iceland or some disaster involving an oil tanker things always seem relatively quiet surrounding the law of the sea.

Meanwhile all sorts of subsidiary parts of the embryonic treaty have been incorporated in international law, even without a treaty. All manner of countries have already proclaimed a 200-mile economic zone and this has not led to any great problems.

What the Reagan administration is now doing is really an invitation to retaliatory measures. Various such measures are possible--and are bound to occur in potentially explosive straits--and would definitely not benefit world stability. It is to be hoped above all that the Reagan administration will bear in mind that even seemingly limited conflicts over the law of the sea could easily escalate. Are the manganese nodules worth it?

CSO: 5200 END

END OF FICHE DATE FILMED

4/15/81